



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,823	04/28/2006	Michael W. Trainum	1041006	2840
7590 Michael Haynes 1341 Huntersfield Close Keswick, VA 22947	10/03/2007		EXAMINER HOANG, SON T	
			ART UNIT 2169	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/03/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/577,823	TRAINUM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Son T. Hoang	2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 April 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The instant application having Application No. 10/577,823 has a total of 36 claims pending in the application; there are 3 independent claims and 33 dependent claims, all of which are ready for examination by the Examiner.

Oath/Declaration

2. The Applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the Examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in 37 C.F.R. 1.63.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. No submission of the Information Disclosure Statement is acknowledged.

Priority

4. The Applicant's claim for priority of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/515,566 (filed on October 29, 2003) is confirmed. The Examiner takes the provisional filing date of October 29, 2003 into consideration.

Specification

5. The Specification is objected by the Examiner. Evidently, at least the "Summary of The Invention" section is missing. Appropriate corrections are required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Abstract

6. The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.

Drawings

7. The drawings were received on April 28, 2006. These drawings are acceptable for the examination purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. **Claims 1-22, and 36,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matters.

Regarding **claim 1**, a “*system*” is being claimed. However, the Applicant did not explicitly claim any hardware component(s) in this instant “*system*”. Consequently, the Examiner views this claimed “*system*” as consisting only of software components, i.e. “*a database*”, and “*a computer-based document management module*”. These claimed “*database*” and “*module*” can easily be interpreted by a person with ordinary skills in the art as software per se and functional descriptive material consisting of data structures and computer programs, which impart functionality when employed as a computer component.

Furthermore, the Applicant stated that “*a database*” as “*one or more structured sets of persistent data, usually associated with software to update and query the data*” (Specification, Page 3, [025]) and “*a computer-based document management module*” as “*a set of instructions for operating a processor*” (Specification, Page 5, [40]). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

Claims 2-22 fail to resolve the deficiencies of **claim 1** since they only further limit the scope of **claim 1**. Hence, **claims 2-22** are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The claims above lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a

combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized.

Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See Diehr, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.")

Regarding **claim 36**, "*a machine readable medium*" is being claimed. However, the Applicant did not explicitly provide any definition and/or example for this instant "*machine readable medium*" in the disclosure. Consequently, the Examiner views this claimed "*machine readable medium*" to include "*a*

transmission media" (Specification, Page 6, [41]), which typically embodies computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules or other data in modulated data signal such as carrier wave or other transport mechanism and includes any information delivery media. As such, the claims are drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim is not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate Paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this Section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. **Claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 19-20; 23-31, 33, 35; and 36;** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schneid (Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002).

Regarding **claim 1**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a system (*Figure 2*), comprising:

a database storing a plurality of objects ([0030], and Figure 4); and

a computer-based document management module ([0033])

adapted to:

create a source document comprising the plurality of objects

(Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]); and

automatically and individually control a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents derived from the source document (*a user known as the program manager has program manager privileges and can determine the access privileges that each user may assert over each element of a visual business communication such as a brochure. For example, there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on*

properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 2**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to define a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding **claim 3**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to prevent modification of a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the*

permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 4**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to publish the source document (*the system coordinates live content file conversion into an output format and delivers to an output provider, [0010]*).

Regarding **claim 5**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to generate a derived document from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 6**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to derive each of the multiple documents from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 7**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to propagate the content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission of

the source document to each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 8 shows the output logic flow. Output logic 800 utilizes Templates object 411, images object 412, Fonts object 413, data lists object 414, Privileges object 415, Approvers object 417 and documents object 420 to produce Output for proofs or final output, preferably in Postscript, Portable Document format or XML. The output functions are preferably controlled using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]*).

Regarding **claim 8**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to prevent modification of the content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission in each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]*).

Regarding **claim 9**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to determine an identity of the source document from each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 7 shows the comment logic flow of this exemplary*

embodiment. Comment logic 700 utilizes privileges object 415 to operate on comment subject 416 and documents object 420. Comments and versions are tracked for each document, each object of the document and for each version by user. The comment functions are preferably executed using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]).

Regarding **claim 12**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to language-independently search the database (*Different translations may be manually or automatically applied to sections or objects of the content, [0035]*).

Regarding **claim 14**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein each of the plurality of objects is stored only once in said database (*DTP conversion 430 sends a native DTP file to Application Server 400 where Import Conversion Templates and Logic 440 operate on the Templates object 411 for each converted file, [0030]*).

Regarding **claim 15**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises content formatting information (*The Import content logic 450 sends content such as JPG and EPS formatted content objects to the images object 412 and other data objects in TTF or Type 1 format to Fonts object 413, [0030]*).

Regarding **claim 16**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises content type information (*The conversion*

processor scans the native file 920 to detect each object 950 thereof and for each object 950, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]).

Regarding **claim 17**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises document structure information (a *design object 952 is parsed with location and format information and the interrelationships of each of the objects 950 and 952 are determined and stored in an object interrelation object 954*. Similarly permissions object 953 may begin with standard permissions from a DTD or may be added by work flow clients, [0039]).

Regarding **claim 19**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects comprises a text object (*the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]*).

Regarding **claim 20**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects comprises a graphical object (*the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]*).

Regarding **claim 23**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a method, comprising a plurality of activities comprising:

via a computer-based document management module ([0033]):

creating a source document comprising a plurality of objects, each of said plurality of objects stored in a database (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]*); and

automatically and individually controlling a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents derived from the source document (*a user known as the program manager has program manager privileges and can determine the access privileges that each user may assert over each element of a visual business communication such as a brochure. For example, there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on*

properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 24**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising defining a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding **claim 25**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising preventing modification of a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding **claim 26**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising publishing the source document (*the system coordinates live content file conversion into an output format and delivers to an output provider, [0010]*).

Regarding **claim 27**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising generating a derived document from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 28**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising deriving each of the multiple documents from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 29**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising propagating the content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission of the source document to each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 8 shows the output logic flow. Output logic 800 utilizes Templates object 411, images object 412, Fonts object 413, data lists object 414, Privileges object 415, Approvers object 417 and documents object 420 to produce Output for proofs or final output, preferably in Postscript, Portable Document format or XML. The output*

functions are preferably controlled using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]).

Regarding claim 30, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising preventing modification of the content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission in each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding claim 31, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising determining an identity of the source document from each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 7 shows the comment logic flow of this exemplary embodiment. Comment logic 700 utilizes privileges object 415 to operate on comment subject 416 and documents object 420. Comments and versions are tracked for each document, each object of the document and for each version by user. The comment functions are preferably executed using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]).*

Regarding **claim 33**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising searching across the source document and each document derived from the source document (*Different translations may be manually or automatically applied to sections or objects of the content, [0035]*).

Regarding **claim 35**, Schneid further discloses a method, wherein each of the plurality of objects is stored only once in said database (*DTP conversion 430 sends a native DTP file to Application Server 400 where Import Conversion Templates and Logic 440 operate on the Templates object 411 for each converted file, [0030]*).

Regarding **claim 36**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a machine readable medium storing instructions for activities ([Column 4, Claim 16]) comprising:

creating a source document comprising a plurality of objects, each of said plurality of objects stored in a database (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]*); and

automatically and individually controlling a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents derived from

the source document (a user known as the program manager has program manager privileges and can determine the access privileges that each user may assert over each element of a visual business communication such as a brochure. For example, there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the

examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. **Claims 10, 11 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002) in view of Hallett et al. (Pub. No. US 2004/0216033, filed on April 23, 2003; hereinafter Hallett).**

Regarding **claims 10, and 32**, Schneid does not explicitly disclose a bi-directional comparison of the source document and a derivative document derived from the source document.

Hallet discloses validating one or more data blocks in a document derived from another document includes one or more processors collectively operable to access a number of first values in a predetermined portion of a source document and apply a code-generating algorithm to the first values to generate a first code representing the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document. The one or more processors are further operable to access a number of second values in a predetermined portion of a document derived from the source document, the predetermined portion of the derived document corresponding to the predetermined portion of the source document, and apply the code-generating algorithm to the second values to generate a second code representing the second values in the predetermined portion of the derived document. If the first code representing the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document matches the second code representing the second values in the predetermined portion of the derived document, it can be

assumed that within a predefined probability the derived document was accurately derived from the source document in that the second values in the predetermined portion of the derived document match the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document ([0004]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Hallett with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of reducing or eliminating the error in validating document data ([0003] of Hallett).

Regarding **claim 11**, Hallett further discloses a system to perform a bi-directional comparison of a first derivative document derived from the source document and a second derivative document derived from the source document (Figures 5A & 5B).

15. **Claims 13, and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002) in view of Withgott et al. (Pat. No. US 5,491,760, published on February 13, 1996; hereinafter Withgott).

Regarding **claims 13, and 34**, Schneid does not disclose generating an auxiliary document from the source document, the auxiliary document reflecting at least a portion of a structure of the source document, at least a portion of a content of the auxiliary document differing from a content of the source document.

Withgott discloses the second phase of the document analysis involves processing (step 50) the identified significant image units to produce an auxiliary or supplemental document image reflective of the contents of the source document image. It will be appreciated that the format in which the identified significant image units are presented can be varied as desired. Thus, the identified significant image units could be presented in reading order to form one or more phrases, or presented in a listing in order of relative frequency of occurrence. Likewise, the supplemental document image need not be limited to just the identified significant image units ([Column 33, Lines 46-65]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Withgott with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of automatically excerpting and summarizing a document image without decoding the contents ([Column 3, Lines 9-12] of Withgott).

16. **Claims 18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002) in view of Jones et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0188841, published on December 12, 2002; hereinafter Jones).**

Regarding **claim 18**, Schneid does not explicitly disclose the plurality of content attributes comprises content creator information.

Jones discloses a watermark is embedded into media content and the watermark conveys watermark information, such as a content identifier and creator identifier, ([0008]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Jones with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of enabling digital asset management to reliably link media content with additional data about the content ([0005] of Jones).

Regarding **claim 21**, Jones further discloses the plurality of objects comprises an audio object ([0049]).

Regarding **claim 22**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects comprises a video object ([0049]).

Conclusion

17. These following prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure:

Young (Pat. No. US 6,038,567) teaches method and system for propagating object properties in a desktop publishing program.

Ainsbury et al. (Pat. No. US 6,078,924) teaches method and apparatus for performing data collection, interpretation and analysis, in an information platform.

The Examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support(s) must be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the Examiner in prosecuting the application.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Son T. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1752. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 AM – 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ali can be reached on (571) 272-4105. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S.H./

Son T. Hoang

Patent Examiner

August 26, 2007

Son T. Hoang
SPL 21 b9
8/28